

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1, 8, and 25 objected to because of the following informalities: Each claim should read *a* computerized export control system, not *an* computerized export control system. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. **Claims 1-7, 9, and 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beck (2004/0117337).**

As per claim 1, Beck teaches a method used by a computerized export control system for online information in a primary country, (Abstract, lines 1-3) comprising:

allowing log-on by a user to the computerized export control system only when the user has verified citizenship that is recorded and available to the computerized export control system. (via Fig. 2, Box 110 for login; ¶ 31, lines 3-4, where determining US person status is equivalent to determining citizenship)

As per claim 2, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

presenting a legal consequences alert to the user; (¶ 15, export compliance information informs the user about any export restrictions that apply to the document)

accepting a citizenship selection from the user; (Fig. 9 shows accepted US Person Status, where US Person Status is equivalent to citizenship) and

recording the citizenship selection as the user's verified citizenship (Fig. 9 shows recorded US Person Status, where US Person Status is equivalent to citizenship)

As per claim 4, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

requiring the user to identify a permanent residency status in the primary country when the citizenship selection is other than the primary country. (¶ 31, lines 7-12 give an example of the procedure when a citizen is out of the primary country)

As per claim 5, Beck teaches the method wherein the verified citizenship is obtained from a personnel records system. (¶ 31, lines 3-4)

As per claim 6, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

recording a work country of the user that is determined from a business location of the user recorded in personnel records system. (Fig. 9 shows the location of the user, ¶ 31, lines 7-12 explain how the work country is determined)

As per claim 7, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

identifying a first user as an Export Control Specialist when the first user's log-on identification matches an identification in a list of Export Control Specialists available to the computerized export control system; (this is inherent in ¶ 17, via identifying possible recipients) and

accepting an alteration of the second user's recorded license status for a document from the Export Control Specialist. (¶ 17 allows the Export Control Specialist, "a compliance officer" to edit a document according to "knowledge of applicable compliance rules and regulations and any identified possible recipients", which would include accepting an alteration of the second user's recorded license status)

As per claim 9, Beck the method further comprising:

providing a selection to the user to indicate whether an exportation of the new document is known to be restricted by the government of the primary country by other than ECCN's, (¶ 16, lines 19-22, where selecting or deselecting terms on the concepts page based upon knowledge of the rules is equivalent to indicated whether or not export is known to be restricted by the government of the primary country by other than ECCN's) and

recording the selection made by the user. (¶ 17, lines 10-11, where storing in a database is equivalent to recording)

As per claim 12, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

permitting user access to a document under when at least one of the following conditions is true:

the user has an export license for the document. (¶ 15, lines 2-6, where the user accesses the document and the export license information)

As per claim 13, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

automatically notifying at least on Export Control Specialist when a document is submitted and the document has an export workflow restriction. (¶ 17, lines 1-3, where the means of automatically notifying the specialist is an email, and “a hit list” is the equivalent of a list of workflow restrictions)

As per claim 14, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

recording a document as having an export workflow restriction when there is an entry participant that is recorded as having a user export restriction for the document. (¶ 29, where a foreign notational is a restricted user, and tagging the document is the equivalent at a workflow restriction)

As per claim 15, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

determining that a document is commerce restricted when no ECCN's are recorded for the document. (¶ 17, lines 4-7, where the export compliance officer determines commerce restrictions regardless of ECCN's)

As per claim 16, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

recording a user as having no user export restriction for a document when the user is recorded as being an author for the document. (¶ 5, allows a user [the person who submitted the document, presumably the author] to submit a document for a compliance review, until this point the user has not export restrictions)

As per claim 17, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

recording a user as having no user export restriction for a document when the user has a license status recorded that indicates the user is licensed for the document. (¶ 28, allows a

foreign national who would otherwise not be allowed access to acquire briefing and debriefing to access the document where being able to access a document is the equivalent of having no restriction)

As per claim 18, Beck teaches the method further comprising determining a user commerce restriction for a document based on at least one of the following criteria:

whether the work country recorded for the user is recorded as a restricted country. (¶ 31, lines 8-12, where work country is used to determine if the export country is restricted)

As per claim 19, Beck teaches the method further comprising determining a user non-commerce restriction for a document based on at least on of the following criteria:

whether the work country recorded for the user is the primary county. (¶ 31, lines 3-8, where determining US person status is the equivalent of determining if the work country is the primary country)

As per claim 20, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

recording a user as having no user export restriction for a document when the document is not commerce restricted and there is no user non-commerce restriction for the document. (¶ 18, lines 1-3, explains that users have access to the document and compliance information [including any restrictions] on a server [indicating the information is recorded], if the document is not commerce restricted and there is no user non-commerce restriction for the document, it will be evident from the records)

As per claim 21, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

recording a user as having no user export restriction for a document when there is no user commerce restriction for the document and there is no user non-commerce restriction for the

document. ((¶ 18, lines 1-3, explains that users have access to the document and compliance information [including any restrictions] on a server [indicating the information is recorded], if there is no user commerce restriction for the document and there is no user non-commerce restriction for the document, it will be evident from the records)

As per claim 22, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

removing a title of a document from a list of one or more documents when the user has a user export restriction for the document. (¶ 21, lines 4-10, a user export restriction is a type of security rule, as such the classifier application will remove it from the information stream)

As per claim 23, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

preventing a viewing of a document when the user has a user export restriction for the document. (¶ 28, lines 1-4 give an example of a restricted user who cannot gain access)

As per claim 24, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

recording a document as entered when all entry participants are recorded as having no user export restriction for the document. (¶ 17, lines 9-11, where document and compliance info are recorded onto database in all cases, including when entry participants are recorded as having no user export restrictions)

As per claim 25, Beck teaches the method used in a computerized export control system for online information in a primary country, comprising:

recording a document as being commerce restricted when at least one of the following statements are true; no classification control number (ECCN) is recorded for the document, and at least one recorded ECCN is export controlled. (¶ 17, lines 4-7 and 9-11, where storing a document and compliance information in a database is equivalent to recording a document as

being commerce restricted when a compliance officer reviews a hit list according to compliance rules and regulations. The rules and regulations would include restricting export controlled ECCN's.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck (2004/0117337) in view of examiners official notice.

As per Claim 3, Beck fails to explicitly define a method for denying an online change of verified citizenship from a country that is recorded as being restricted to a country that is recorded as being not restricted. Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known in the art of database management to restrict database modifications. In view of examiner's official notice, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to restrict an online

change of verified citizenship from a country that is recorded as being restricted to a country that is recorded as being not restricted.

As per claim 8, Beck fails to explicitly disclose a method used in a computerized export control system for online information in a primary county, comprising:

recording an export control classification number (ECCN) for a new document, when a user entered ECCN matches an ECCN on a recorded list of valid ECCN's.

Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known to use valid ECCNs in the art of export compliance, examiner further notes that the ECCN is export compliance information. When Beck (¶ 14, lines 16-17) is read in the light of examiners official notice, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to record an export control classification number (ECCN) for a new document, when a user entered ECCN matches an ECCN on a recorded list of valid ECCN's.

7. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck (2004/0117337) in view of Dane (6,785,679).

As per claim 10, Beck teaches the method further comprising:

providing at least one field to the user for identifying one or more entry participants when an option of drafting a new document has been selected by the user; (Fig. 8 shows a document with multiple users indicating the presence of this step)

recording the one or more entry participants identified by the user (Fig. 8);

However, Beck fails to explicitly disclose automatically notify the one or more identified entry participants that the new document is submitted when a draft of a document is submitted by

the user. Dane, also in the field of document management, teaches that a user “can choose to be notified when the forms are submitted”. (Col. 7, lines 39-40)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the notification teachings of Dane with the methods of Beck. A users desire to have both knowledge and confirmation that a document has been submitted is motivation for this combination.

As per claim 11, Beck fails to further teach the method for obtaining an identification of a manager of at least one of the one or more entry participants from a personnel records system; and recording the manager as an entry participant for the new document.

Dane in the same field of invention teaches that the “system also may track the activity” of a manager and such activities include the date and the time of the access. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Dane with the methods of Beck. Motivation to combine comes from that in dealing with secure information, the most complete records are the most desirable.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Zinssmeister (2004/0243516) teaches a license determination request system and Kaplan (2003/0041033) teaches a business transaction system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael P. Lux whose telephone number is 571-270-5104. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynda Jasmin can be reached on 571-270-3033. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

mpl

/Lynda Jasmin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4127